

REMARKS

Attorney for Applicants has carefully reviewed the outstanding Office Action on the above-identified application. Claims 1-2 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claim 1 and added new claim 2 in the application as set forth herein, and submit that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code [page 4 lines 13]. Applicant has deleted the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the terms "said application data stores" and "said data stores" lacked proper antecedent basis. Claim 1 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the terms. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor, US patent no. 6,256,676 in view of Vijaykumar, US patent

no. 5,745,896. The Examiner states that Taylor teaches a system for synchronizing data between applications (applications, col. 10 lines 40-60) having respective data stores (application resources, col. 13 lines 1-5 and fig. 2), the system comprising the steps of:

two or more application service adapters (a plurality of adapters, each of which respectively one of the plurality of enterprise applications, abstract and col. 11 lines 40-5- and fig. 2) associates with the application data stores;

an integration engine (engine, col. 11 lines 40-50) having associates therewith an integration engine service adapter (ADK 130, col. 11 lines 40-65) and an integration engine data store (database storage, col. 8 lines 5-20) the integration engine manages the flow of information among all the data stores (pass messages between the computer application which are associates with applicant resources, col. 8 lines 5-20. 10 lines 40-50 and col. 12 lines 25-30). Taylor teaches RDBMS comprising many databases (col. 11 lines 30-40 and fig. 2).

The Examiner states, however, that Taylor “does not explicitly teach a links table for managing shared integration data.” The Examiner goes on to state that “Vijaykumar teaches RDBMS which has a link table for managing shared integration data (table containing link relationship, col. 14 lines 11-52).” Finally, the Examiner states that “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Taylor and Vijakumar’s system because

Vijaykumar's linking table would be necessary for the RDBMS to maintain the referential integrity of the update or delete rules and enhance the third normalization."

Applicant submits that the invention, as defined by the amended claims, is patentable over Taylor, US patent no. 6,256,676 and Vijaykumar, US patent no. 5,745,896, taken alone or in any combination.

The Office Action points to page column 14, lines 11-52 of Vijaykumar as teaching RDBMS which has a link table for managing shared integration data (table containing link relationship). However, Vijaykumar fails whatsoever to cure the deficiencies of Taylor. Vijaykumar merely describes methods for maintaining referential integrity between data tables that may be freely moved to various remote workstations. In Vijaykumar, column 14, lines 11-14 states that the user chooses the update rule desired. The system then provides two update rules for tables that use referential integrity. In column 14, lines 33-36 Vijaykumar shows a plurality of referential integrity links that may be defined for the information tables. For example, a referential integrity link may be defined linking the Customer Number field to Orders table to the Customer Number field of Customer table. In Vijaykumar, the links are typical RDBMS referential integrity. It is managing "links" for rows in one table to rows in another table.

This is very different from Applicant's invention as defined by the amended claims. The present invention provides user-driven, on-demand integration of applications, particularly primary stand-alone applications. Applicant's invention uses the mechanism as a way to link the same person from one application to another without the concept of a Global Unique ID. Since each application has its own Unique ID associated with a particular person, our mechanism will link them together and generate this Global Unique ID.

For Example:

ID	Person	Application
100	John Smith	A
A32	John Smith	B

Global Unique ID	ID	Person	Application
987655432	100	John Smith	A
987655432	A32	John Smith	B

After the process is complete, it is known that the Global Unique ID of 987655432 is John Smith (ID 100 in Application A, and ID A32 in Application B) so it is now known that these John Smiths are the same person.

Applicant submits that amended independent claim 1, which was rejected as being obvious, and 2, are patentable over these references, taken alone or in combination. It is submitted that the Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all the objections and rejections and pass this case to allowance.

All issues raised in the Office Action are believed to have been addressed. Claim 1 was amended. Claim 1 and 2 are pending in this application. Re-examination is requested and favorable action solicited.


Should any changes to the claims, drawings and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, or should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

This Amendment is believed to be timely filed. In the event that a petition for extension of time and/or any other petitions and/or fees are required, consider this a request for such petition and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee to Deposit Account No. 06-2143.

Appl. No. 10/039,981
Amdt. Dated: 1/19/2005
Reply to Office Action of: 10/19/2004

Docket No: 9626/5

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 4/14/05

Joe H. Shallenburger
Reg. No. 37,937
Attorney for Applicant
Wolff & Samson PC
One Boland Drive
West Orange, NJ 07052
Tel.: (973) 530-2072
Fax.: (973) 530-2272
jshallenburger@wolffsamson.com